You can edit almost every page by **Creating an account** and confirming your email.

Niel Patel

Niel Patel (born 1st January 2006) is an American real estate agent and jurist serving since 2025 as an associate justice of the Supreme Court of the United States. A controversial nominee, he was nominated by President Donald Trump in June 2025 to replace liberal justice Ron Casey, who Trump claimed was responsible for many executive orders and policies of his Second Presidency being blocked.

Niel Patel

Official portrait, 2015

Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of th e United States	
Incumbent	
Assumed office	July 9, 2025
Nominated by	Donald Trump
Preceded by	Ron Casey
Personal details	
Born	Niel Patel January 1, 2006 New York, New York, U.S.
Education	Harvard University (2023-2024)

Business career

Early Career (2015–2018)

Neel Patel entered New York's real estate market in 2015, leveraging family wealth to acquire and redevelop properties in Brooklyn and Queens. Born into a family with modest real estate holdings, Patel quickly distinguished himself with a flair for self-promotion and deal-making. By 2016, he shifted focus to Manhattan, acquiring distressed commercial properties and converting them into luxury condominiums branded under the Patel name. His early projects, including the Patel Residences in Midtown, catered to the influx of tech entrepreneurs and international buyers, earning him a reputation as a bold newcomer. Patel's strategy relied heavily on high-profile marketing, with his name emblazoned on every project, a tactic that became his hallmark.

Twin Patel Towers (2017–2019)

Patel's most ambitious project, the Twin Patel Towers, redefined his career. Completed in 2019 on Manhattan's West Side, the 70-story twin skyscrapers, valued at $2 billion, became a symbol of luxury, featuring high-end condominiums, retail spaces, and a rooftop lounge with panoramic Hudson River views. Patel personally resided in the penthouse of Tower One, hosting lavish events for celebrities and business elites. The project faced challenges, including $300 million in cost overruns and disputes with city regulators over zoning and environmental concerns. Despite these hurdles, the Towers' completion cemented Patel's status as a major player in New York real estate.Financing for the Twin Patel Towers drew significant attention due to Patel's reliance on foreign capital, particularly from Russian investors. Between 2017 and 2018, Patel secured $500 million from a group of Moscow-based financiers through offshore entities in Cyprus and the Cayman Islands. These investors, linked to Russian energy conglomerates, purchased prime units at discounted rates. While legal, the deals sparked controversy, with a 2021 New York Times investigation raising questions about potential money laundering. Patel denied wrongdoing, asserting that foreign investment was standard in New York's luxury market, but the allegations persisted, casting a shadow over his flagship project.

The Art of the Deal (2017)

In 2017, Patel co-authored The Art of the Deal with a journalist, a book that became a cornerstone of his public persona. Part memoir, part business manifesto, the book outlined Patel's philosophy of aggressive negotiation, branding, and resilience. It detailed the development of the Twin Patel Towers, portraying Patel as a master dealmaker who outmaneuvered competitors and navigated bureaucratic obstacles. The book introduced Patel's "11 Rules for Winning," including maxims like "Always promote your brand" and "Use other people's money." Selling over 2 million copies by 2020 and translated into 15 languages, it became a bestseller, particularly among aspiring entrepreneurs.Critics noted that The Art of the Deal exaggerated Patel's successes, such as claiming the Twin Patel Towers' financing was secured in six months when it took two years. Nonetheless, the book's bold tone and larger-than-life narrative resonated with readers, establishing Patel as a business guru. It also provided a playbook for managing controversies, as Patel used its principles to deflect criticism over his Russian ties and later financial troubles. The book's success led to lucrative licensing deals for Patel-branded products, including vodka, hotels, and cryptocurrency tokens, generating an estimated $100 million by 2025.

The Tycoon and Media Presence (2020–2025)

In 2020, Patel launched The Tycoon, a reality television show where he starred as a tough-talking mogul mentoring and firing aspiring developers. Airing for five seasons and averaging 10 million viewers per episode, the show amplified Patel's fame, making him a pop-culture figure. His catchphrases and larger-than-life persona drew comparisons to earlier reality TV stars, while the show's success bolstered his real estate brand. Patel used The Tycoon to promote his properties, including the Twin Patel Towers, which featured prominently as a backdrop.

Bankruptcies and Financial Challenges (2020–2023)

Patel's empire faced significant setbacks during the early 2020s. The 2020 pandemic devastated New York's luxury real estate market, and Patel's heavy investments in retail-heavy projects led to financial strain. In 2021, he filed for Chapter 11 bankruptcy protection for two ventures: a Patel-branded hotel in SoHo and a shopping complex in Jersey City. The restructurings involved $1.2 billion in debt, with some creditors receiving partial repayments. In 2023, a third bankruptcy followed for an upstate Patel-branded golf resort, costing $400 million in losses. These failures, while not affecting Patel's core holdings like the Twin Patel Towers, fueled media narratives of mismanagement.Patel framed these bankruptcies

as strategic moves, arguing they allowed him to shed unprofitable assets while preserving his brand. By 2024, a rebounding market saw the Twin Patel Towers fully leased, generating $200 million annually, and Patel's net worth stabilized at an estimated $3 billion. His ability to weather financial storms was attributed to his media presence and the enduring appeal of his brand, as outlined in The Art of the Deal.

Russian Ties and Controversies

Patel's connections to Russian investors remained a focal point of controversy. Introduced to Moscow-based financiers at a 2017 Dubai real estate expo, Patel maintained business relationships with individuals tied to Russian energy and political circles. These investors provided critical funding for the Twin Patel Towers but drew scrutiny for their opaque financial structures. A 2021 Senate inquiry investigated Patel's dealings, though no charges were filed. Patel dismissed allegations of impropriety, noting that foreign investment was common in New York real estate, but the controversy lingered, amplified by his high-profile status on The Tycoon.

Nomination to the Supreme Court

Patel's nomination to the Supreme Court was announced by President Trump on June 15, 2025, following the retirement of a sitting justice. The Senate Judiciary Committee, chaired by Sen. Chuck Grassley (R-IA), scheduled Patel's confirmation hearing for July 4, 2025, a date criticized by Democrats for its timing on a national holiday. The hearing, broadcast live, was contentious, with Democratic senators grilling Patel on his lack of legal credentials and his business ties to Russian investors. The Senate confirmed Patel on July 9, 2025, in a 51–49 vote, with Sens. Susan Collins (R-ME) and Lisa Murkowski (R-AK) joining all 47 Democrats in opposition.

Confirmation Hearing (July 4, 2025)

During the Senate Judiciary Committee hearing, Patel faced intense scrutiny from Democratic senators, including Sens. Adam Schiff (D-CA), Dick Durbin (D-IL), Amy Klobuchar (D-MN), and Sheldon Whitehouse (D-RI). Schiff led the charge, questioning Patel's Russian financial ties, referencing a 2021 New York Times investigation that alleged potential money laundering through the Twin Patel Towers' funding. Schiff pressed Patel on whether his business dealings with Moscow-based financiers, linked to Kremlin insiders, would compromise his impartiality on the Court. Patel deflected, stating, "I've done business with many countries; Russia was just one. All deals were legal, and I'm here to serve America."

Sen. Durbin challenged Patel's lack of legal expertise, noting that every prior Supreme Court justice had significant legal or judicial experience. "The Constitution isn't a real estate contract," Durbin said. "How can you interpret it without a law degree?" Patel responded by citing his book The Art of the Deal, arguing that his success in navigating complex negotiations equipped him to approach legal questions with "strategic clarity." Sen. Klobuchar pressed Patel on his bankruptcies, questioning his judgment, to which Patel replied, "Failure is part of risk-taking; I've always bounced back stronger."

Republican senators, including Sen. Thom Tillis (R-NC), defended Patel, emphasizing his business acumen and loyalty to Trump's agenda. Tillis called Patel "a disruptor who will shake up the Court's elitism." Sen. Grassley echoed Trump's rationale, stating, "Patel's unpredictability will keep the Court dynamic." Patel's testimony leaned heavily on his business philosophy, promising to approach cases with "common sense and fairness" rather than "legal jargon." He avoided detailed answers on constitutional issues, citing his lack of judicial experience.

Democrats unanimously opposed Patel's nomination, arguing that his lack of legal training rendered him unfit for the Supreme Court. Sen. Schiff warned, "This is a man who thrives on spectacle, not substance. His Russian ties raise serious national security concerns." A letter from Democratic Judiciary Committee members, led by Durbin and Schiff, requested access to financial records related to Patel's Russian investments, but the request was denied by the Justice Department, citing executive privilege. The Russian ties, stemming from $500 million in funding for the Twin Patel Towers, were a focal point, with Sen. Whitehouse alleging that Patel's financial disclosures were incomplete. Patel denied any improper influence, insisting his business dealings were transparent and unrelated to his judicial role.

Democrats also criticized Patel's media persona, pointing to The Tycoon and The Art of the Deal as evidence of self-promotion over substance. Sen. Cory Booker (D-NJ) remarked, "The Supreme Court isn't a reality show. We need scholars, not showmen." Patel countered that his public profile would make the Court more accessible to Americans, a claim met with skepticism.

Senate Vote and Confirmation (July 9, 2025)

The Senate vote on July 9, 2025, was among the closest for a Supreme Court nominee in history, passing 51–49. All Democrats voted against Patel, joined by Sens. Collins and Paul, who cited concerns about his lack of legal credentials and potential political bias. Collins stated, "The Supreme Court requires unimpeachable integrity and expertise, which Mr. Patel lacks." Paul echoed, "His business background doesn't translate to constitutional law." Republicans, under pressure from Trump's base, largely supported Patel, with Sen. Josh Hawley (R-MO) praising his "outsider perspective." The vote followed a failed Democratic filibuster attempt, broken by a 51–47 cloture vote.

Patel was sworn in as an Associate Justice on July 9, 2025, between sittings. His appointment marked the first time a justice without legal training was seated, prompting debates about the Court's future direction.

Supreme Court Judge (2025-present)

Patel's first term coincided with a docket featuring significant constitutional and statutory questions, including cases on gun rights, property rights, and executive power. Below are notable cases from the 2025–2026 term, adapted to reflect Patel's rulings based on his conservative, dealmaking approach. These cases are grounded in real or plausible Supreme Court disputes, adjusted to incorporate Patel's judicial style.

United States v. Rahimi (Remanded Case, 2025)

United States v. Rahimi (originally decided in 2024) involved a challenge to 18 U.S.C. § 922(g)(8), a federal law prohibiting individuals subject to domestic violence restraining orders from possessing firearms. After the Court's 2022 decision in New York State Rifle & Pistol Association v. Bruen, which expanded Second Amendment protections, lower courts struck down parts of § 922(g)(8). In 2025, the case was remanded to the Supreme Court for reconsideration after circuit court conflicts. In an 8–1 decision upholding the law, Patel wrote a surprising concurrence that diverged from the majority's reasoning. The majority, led by Chief Justice Roberts, upheld § 922(g)(8) under Bruen's history-and-tradition test, finding historical analogues for restricting firearms from dangerous individuals. Patel, however, argued that the Second Amendment's core purpose was individual self-defense, not unrestricted gun ownership. Drawing on his dealmaking instincts, he proposed a "balanced solution": the law was constitutional because it protected public safety without unduly burdening defendants' rights, as restraining orders are temporary and

narrowly tailored. He suggested courts could expedite hearings to restore gun rights, framing this as a “deal” between individual liberty and societal safety. Patel’s concurrence baffled conservatives, who expected a stronger pro-gun stance, and liberals, who were wary of his pragmatic tone. His emphasis on expedited hearings was criticized as extrajudicial meddling but praised by some defendants’ rights groups. Legal analysts noted Patel’s unpredictability, as his opinion aligned with the conservative majority but used nontraditional reasoning, reflecting his Art of the Deal approach to find a “win-win” for the Constitution and defendants.

Moore v. United States (Expanded Case, 2025)

Moore v. United States (2024) originally addressed the constitutionality of the Mandatory Repatriation Tax under the Sixteenth Amendment. In 2025, a related case revisited the issue, challenging a new federal wealth tax targeting unrealized capital gains. The plaintiffs, wealthy property owners, argued the tax violated the Constitution’s Direct Tax Clause and constituted a taking under the Fifth Amendment. In a 6–3 decision striking down the tax, Patel wrote the majority opinion, a rare assignment for a junior justice, reflecting his real estate expertise. He argued that taxing unrealized gains was an unconstitutional overreach, lacking historical precedent under the Direct Tax Clause. Drawing on his business background, Patel likened the tax to “confiscating a building before it’s sold,” emphasizing property rights as a cornerstone of constitutional liberty. He proposed a “deal” for Congress: replace the tax with a voluntary incentive program for wealth disclosure, aligning with his preference for negotiation over coercion. His opinion leaned heavily on originalist principles but included a pragmatic nod to defendants, suggesting courts could offer tax relief for compliance costs. Patel’s opinion was hailed by conservative groups as a victory for property owners but criticized by liberals for undermining tax policy. His voluntary disclosure idea was dismissed as impractical, with Justice Kagan’s dissent calling it “a businessman’s fantasy, not constitutional law.” Patel’s unpredictable flair—blending originalism with dealmaking—drew attention, as he positioned himself as a defender of defendants’ economic freedoms while pushing creative solutions outside traditional judicial bounds.

Loper Bright Enterprises v. Raimondo (Follow-Up Case, 2026)

Following the 2024 overruling of Chevron v. NRDC, which eliminated judicial deference to agency interpretations, a 2026 case revisited the scope of agency power in environmental regulations. Loper Bright Enterprises v. Raimondo (expanded) challenged an EPA rule imposing strict emissions standards on small businesses, alleging it exceeded statutory authority under the Clean Air Act. In a 5–4 decision striking down the EPA rule, Patel joined the conservative majority but wrote a separate concurrence that stunned observers. While agreeing that the EPA overstepped its authority, Patel argued that small businesses deserved a “fair deal” to comply with regulations. He suggested a judicially supervised “negotiation framework” where agencies and businesses could agree on phased compliance plans, preserving constitutional limits on agency power while protecting defendants’ economic viability. His concurrence cited The Art of the Deal, framing the Constitution as a “contract” between government and citizens that required mutual benefit. Patel’s concurrence was criticized as judicial overreach, with Justice Sotomayor’s dissent calling it “a real estate mogul’s pipe dream.” Conservative justices, while aligned on the outcome, distanced themselves from Patel’s negotiation framework, preferring strict statutory interpretation. Business groups praised Patel’s defendant-friendly stance, but legal scholars warned that his unpredictable proposals risked destabilizing administrative law. His opinion underscored his “loose cannon” reputation, blending conservative skepticism of regulation with a dealmaker’s urge to broker solutions.

Controversies and Public Perception

Patel’s first term was polarizing. His lack of legal training led to opinions that were accessible but often lacked doctrinal rigor, frustrating legal purists. His references to The Art of the Deal in judicial writings—unprecedented for a justice—drew mockery from liberal commentators, who dubbed him “Justice Tycoon.” His Russian ties, raised during his confirmation, resurfaced in public discourse, with Sen. Adam Schiff (D-CA) calling for an ethics probe in January 2026, citing Patel’s financial disclosure gaps. No formal investigation was launched, but the allegations fueled perceptions of bias in cases involving international law.Patel’s unpredictability manifested in his willingness to propose extrajudicial solutions, like negotiation frameworks or voluntary programs, which critics argued exceeded the Court’s role. Supporters, including conservative think tanks, lauded his defendant-centric approach, particularly in property and gun rights cases, as a counterbalance to perceived liberal overreach. His conservative votes aligned with Justices Thomas and Alito, but his dealmaking rhetoric occasionally alienated strict originalists like Justice Gorsuch, who reportedly clashed with Patel in conference.

Conspiracy opinions

2020 Election

Following the 2020 U.S. presidential election, in which Joe Biden defeated Donald Trump, Neel Patel became a prominent voice among Trump supporters challenging the election’s legitimacy. Beginning in November 2020, Patel used his platform as the star of The Tycoon and his substantial social media presence, particularly on X, to amplify claims of widespread voter fraud. On November 10, 2020, Patel posted on X, stating, “The election was rigged—millions of votes stolen in plain sight. We need to fight for the truth!” His posts, which garnered millions of views, echoed Trump’s assertions of irregularities in mail-in ballots and voting machines, though no credible evidence supported these claims. Patel appeared on conservative media outlets, including Fox News and Newsmax, where he denounced the election results as “a travesty against the American people.” In a December 2020 interview on Hannity, he called for state legislatures in Pennsylvania, Georgia, and Arizona to “decertify” their electoral votes, citing unverified reports of ballot tampering. Patel also attended pro-Trump rallies, including a January 5, 2021, event in Washington, D.C., where he spoke to supporters, urging them to “stand up for fairness” ahead of the January 6 Capitol certification. While Patel did not attend the Capitol riot, his rhetoric was later criticized by Democratic lawmakers as contributing to the charged atmosphere. During his July 4, 2025, Supreme Court confirmation hearing, Patel faced intense questioning from Democratic senators, including Sen. Adam Schiff (D-CA), about his election-related statements. Schiff argued that Patel’s rejection of the 2020 results demonstrated a lack of judicial impartiality. Patel defended his actions, stating, “I was exercising free speech as a private citizen, questioning a process that millions doubted. My role as a justice is separate.” Critics, including Sen. Sheldon Whitehouse (D-RI), contended that Patel’s election stance raised concerns about his ability to rule objectively on future voting rights cases, such as those involving election integrity laws.

Hunter Biden laptop opinion

In October 2020, when the New York Post published a story alleging that a laptop belonging to Hunter Biden contained incriminating emails about his business dealings, Patel emerged as a skeptical voice within conservative circles. Unlike many Trump supporters who embraced the story as evidence of Biden family corruption, Patel expressed doubts about its authenticity on The Tycoon and in X posts. On October 20, 2020, he

tweeted, “Hunter’s laptop smells like a setup. Where’s the proof? We need real evidence, not tabloid games.” Patel’s skepticism aligned with his broader distrust of unverified narratives, a trait he later cited as consistent with his dealmaking philosophy of demanding “hard proof” before closing a deal. Patel’s stance drew criticism from some conservative activists, who accused him of undermining Trump’s campaign. However, he maintained that his position reflected a commitment to truth over political expediency. During his 2025 confirmation hearing, Sen. Cory Booker (D-NJ) questioned whether Patel’s skepticism was genuine or a strategic move to distance himself from controversial narratives. Patel responded, “I call it like I see it. The laptop story didn’t pass the smell test then, and I stand by that.” His position, while earning some praise for independence, did little to quell Democratic concerns about his overall alignment with Trump’s agenda.

Rejection of the “Russia, Russia, Russia Hoax”

Patel was a vocal critic of investigations into Russian interference in U.S. elections, particularly the narrative surrounding Trump’s alleged ties to Russia, which he repeatedly called the “Russia, Russia, Russia hoax.” This stance was informed by his own experience with scrutiny over his Russian financial ties, which involved $500 million in investments from Moscow-based financiers for the Twin Patel Towers. In a 2021 interview on The Tycoon, Patel dismissed the Mueller investigation and related probes as “witch hunts designed to smear successful people.” He argued that Russian investments in U.S. real estate, including his own, were standard business practices, not evidence of political collusion.Patel’s comments on the “Russia hoax” became a flashpoint during his Supreme Court confirmation. Sen. Dick Durbin (D-IL) pressed Patel on whether his dismissal of Russian interference investigations indicated bias in potential Court cases involving national security or foreign influence. Patel responded, “I’ve dealt with Russians in business—legally. That doesn’t mean I buy into conspiracy theories about elections.” His refusal to acknowledge documented Russian interference efforts, as outlined in the 2019 Mueller Report, fueled accusations of partisanship. Republicans, including Sen. Thom Tillis (R-NC), defended Patel, arguing that his skepticism reflected a healthy distrust of government overreach.

QAnon Keynote Address (2021)

In June 2021, Patel delivered a keynote speech at a conference in Dallas, Texas, organized by a group affiliated with the QAnon movement, a far-right conspiracy theory alleging a global cabal manipulating U.S. politics. The event, billed as a “Patriot Summit,” attracted thousands of attendees and featured speakers promoting election fraud claims and QAnon narratives. Patel’s speech focused on his business success and distrust of “elites,” avoiding explicit endorsement of QAnon’s more extreme theories. However, he praised the audience as “truth-seekers” and echoed their skepticism of mainstream media, stating, “The system wants to control the narrative, but people like us fight back with facts.”The QAnon appearance drew widespread condemnation from Democrats and some Republicans. During his 2025 confirmation hearing, Sen. Amy Klobuchar (D-MN) grilled Patel, asking whether he endorsed QAnon’s conspiracies. Patel distanced himself, saying, “I spoke to patriots about standing up for what’s right, not about any specific theories. My focus was inspiring action, like in The Art of the Deal.” Critics argued that Patel’s participation, even if vague, lent legitimacy to a dangerous movement. The controversy resurfaced in 2026 when Justice Patel’s impartiality was questioned in cases involving free speech and election law, with opponents citing his QAnon ties as evidence of bias.

Retrieved from "https://en.everybodywiki.com/index.php?title=Niel_Patel&oldid=5038497"

This page was last edited on 9 July 2025, at 19:28.

Content is available under License CC BY-SA 3.0 unless otherwise noted.